

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 10-15, 17-19, 23, 28, 35 and 37-41 have been amended. Claims 16, 25, 29, 36 and 43 have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-15, 17-24, 26-28, 30-35, 37-42 and 44-48 are pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 102(e) Rejection:

The Examiner rejected claims 1-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lakritz (U.S. Patent 6,623,529). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons below.

Regarding claim 1, Lakritz fails to disclose creating a first file including a translation of at least one localizable string, wherein the translation includes a user-supplied translation, in contrast to the Examiner's assertion. Lakritz teaches a document localization management and deliver system that automatically determines the language and country of a web site user and delivers, via the web server, appropriately localized content from a country/language database to the user's browser. The Examiner cites, regarding previous claim 7, column 7, line 45 and column 8, lines 53-56 of Lakritz. However, the cited passages do not disclose that a translation of a localizable string includes a user-supplied translation. To the contrary, the first cited passage describes using language databases to obtain translations. The second cited passage describes how visitors to a multilingual web site, such as one created using Lakritz' system, "may wish to enter information and feedback into a fill-out form in their local language to send back to the Web site manager." Lakritz goes on to describe how his system parses, tags and saves the feedback information entered by the user for later translation. Thus, the second passage describes user input to be translated, not user-supplied translations. Neither passage cited by the Examiner mentions a translation of a localizable string including a user-supplied translation. Lakritz does not describe anything about a translation of a localizable string including a user-supplied translation.

For at least the reasons above, the rejection of claim 1 is not supported by the prior art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Similar remarks apply to claims 10 and 19 as well.

Regarding claim 28, Lakritz does not disclose prompting a user for confirmation of the identifying a localizable string. The Examiner cites column 8, lines 53-56 of Lakritz. However, this portion of Lakritz does not mention prompting a user for confirmation of identifying a localizable string. Instead, as described above, the cited passage describes how visitors to a multilingual web site, such as one created using Lakritz' system, "may wish to enter information and feedback into a fill-out form in their local language to send back to the Web site manager." The user input cited by the Examiner has nothing to do with prompting a user for confirmation of the identifying of a localizable string. Lakritz is describing receiving general user input that may be translated, but that has nothing to do with translating any text. The fill-out form mentioned by Lakritz is not a prompt for user confirmation regarding the identifying of a localizable string. Nowhere, in fact, does Lakritz describe prompting a user for confirmation of the identifying of a localizable string. Thus, the rejection of claim 28 is not supported by the prior art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Similar remarks apply to claims 35 and 42 as well.

Applicants also asserts that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION


Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and prompt notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicants hereby petition for such an extension. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-90300/RCK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- ☒ Return Receipt Postcard
- ☐ Petition for Extension of Time
- ☐ Notice of Change of Address
- ☒ Other: Information Disclosure Statement

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Kowert
Reg. No. 39,255
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: November 23, 2005